stood for immediate independence as of yore and for a new deal for the common man. It was an unequal battle. On the one side, Aguinaldo with no organization. On the other side, Quezon backed by the coalition of the parties. Aguinaldo went down to defeat.

Analyses of the character of Aguinaldo are as contradictory as they are numerous. There are those who would deify him into something more than human. The soldier who captured him wrote that "He is a man of many excellent qualities, far and away the best Filipino I ever was brought in contact with." On the other hand, there are those who would make of Aguinaldo a mere figurehead, the usual method being to eulogize his compatriots in order to belittle his accomplish-ments. Certainly full credit should be given to the able men who advised Aguinaldo. Yet when impartial history is writ-ten, it must adjudge that Aguinaldo knew how to listen to his advisers, but always the decision was his, and he was the un-questioned executor of the decision thus reached 5 that he represented cohesion and unity, and that he was a military leader, popular with the masses, who ,gave unselfish service to his country. Aguinaldo also proved that 'be was genuinely honest and sincere, for he carefully conserved-the money paid him by the Spaniards and used it as a trust -fund to organize a new revolution. It was no small thing for a young man, with scant education, living in a small town, in the face of every disadvantage, to weld together a people who had never been unified, and to maintain himself as the

acknowledged leader of a popular uprising which when unsuccessful is stigmatized as an insurrection, but which when successful bears the honored title of a revolution.

Aguinaldo's gameness and sportsmanship have won the admiration of Americans. He fought bravely against great odds. Following capture, his bearing was manly and when he swore allegiance to the American flag he kept his oath faith-